

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Attached hereto is Fig. 3 which includes in the header the phrase “REPLACEMENT SHEET.” Fig. 3 has been amended to remove the reference numeral 2 for which there is no description in the specification.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 are in this application with claims 8 and 9 having been cancelled and claims 5 and 14 having been amended herein. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as Fig. 3 contains a reference numeral "2" which is not described in the specification. A new Fig. 3 bearing the heading REPLACEMENT SHEET is submitted herewith and removing the reference numeral 2. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is requested.

The specification has been objected to because the title of the invention is allegedly not descriptive. In response the title has been amended to adopt the title suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5 and 14 have been amended to include the phrase "sealed vessel." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

On the merits, the Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,051 to Lee. These claims have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot.

Finally, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,380,926. Though characterized by the Examiner as a patent issued to Lee, it is believed that if the patent number is correct, the Examiner intended to refer to this patent as having been issued to the instant applicant, Mr. Ho.

In response to the rejection as terminal disclaimer is filed herewith. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn. Accordingly claims 1-7 and 10-16 are allowable.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

The Examiner has apparently made of record, but not applied, certain documents. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's implicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fee that may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Grace L. Pan  
Reg. No. 39,440

Thomas J. Kowalski  
Reg. No. 32,147

Nathan Weber  
Reg. No. 50,958

Tel. (212) 588-0800  
Fax. (212) 588-0500